

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/647,102	08/21/2003	Daniel W. Aberle	027262-00246-C1	9872	
27805 7	7590 09/11/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
THOMPSON HINE L.L.P.			MENON, KF	MENON, KRISHNAN S	
P.O. BOX 880 DAYTON, OF			. ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1723		
		DATE MAILED: 09/11/2006			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)					
		10/647,102	ABERLE ET AL.					
		Examiner	Art Unit					
		Krishnan S. Menon	1723					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PER WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM  - Extensions of time may be available under the pafter SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the ma  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period Any reply received by the Office later than three earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.	THE MAILING DA provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 this communication. ximum statutory period w d for reply will, by statute, months after the mailing	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim iill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	I. lely filed the mailing date of this co D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status								
	2b)⊠ This ndition for allowar	oril 2006. action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pro ax parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45		merits is				
Disposition of Claims								
4)	is/are withdrav l. <u>32-35</u> is/are rejec ire objected to.	vn from consideration. ted.						
9) The specification is objected to	-							
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.								
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119								
<ol> <li>Copies of the certified of application from the Interest</li> </ol>	e of: priority documents priority documents copies of the priori ernational Bureau	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been receive	on No d in this National \$	Stage				
Attachment(s)		_						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)     Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Ro     Paper No(s)/Mail Date	eview (PTO-948) 1449 or PTO/SB/08)	4) Interview Summary ( Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te	-152)				

Art Unit: 1723

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 14-35 are pending as amended 4/17/06

### **Double Patenting**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 14,16-23,29,30 and 32-35 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,649,048. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the patent recite the limitations of the instant claims.

## Allowable Subject Matter

Application/Control Number: 10/647,102

Art Unit: 1723

Claims 15, 24-28 and 31 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The closest prior arts Lenhart in view of Dolvet do not teach a vent check valve that prevents water from contacting the check valve. The Dolvet check valve, even though protected by a filter from above, would come in contact with the fluids if submerged in the fluid. The Dolvet check valve also does not have an airlock protecting water from entering the valve chamber.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the pending claims have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

This action is made non-final due to a new ground for rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krishnan S. Menon whose telephone number is 571-272-1143. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wanda L. Walker can be reached on 571-272-1151. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/647,102

Art Unit: 1723

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Krishnan S Menon a 6/05

Page 4

Art Unit 1723